

FILED
IN CLERKS OFFICE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Worcester, MASSACHUSETTS

2004 APR 9 P 12:26

Steven Roland Drury
"Plaintiff"

VS

The New England Regional Council of Carpenters
Local 107, Thomas Harrington,
Art Sisko, Simon James, and Kennedy and Rossi Inc.

) **Case Number:**
) 03-CV-11422
)
)
)
) **Motion objection**
) **to Jurisdiction**
) **of subject matter,**
) **Venue, jury demand**
) **demand to correct docket**

"Defendants"

- 1, Plaintiff objection to defence motion to defer (presently)
- 2, Plaintiff motion objection to jurisdiction of federal court jurisdiction re.
- 3 defendants motion under 1414 removal Objection before the court
- 4 plaintiff objection to defendants motion to dismissal filing.

Now comes the plaintiff to demanding his constitutional rights, under common law plaintiff demands to be in a article 3 Constitutional court and waves No rights none Plaintiff demand of the defendants to give proof of removal to federal court and to state grounds plaintiff demands the court to re-file all motions and to act upon all motion by setting a date to be heard on all motions in Worcester venue "In open court in present of plaintiff. The plaintiff also objects to the defendants motion to not consider any or all the plaintiffs filing due to court rule 7.1. Defendants motion to defer his filing because of rule 7.1 rule is outrageous when Defendants did not contract plaintiff in matter of removal to federal court in Boston another venue, Plaintiff does not wish to deal with defendant lawyers or to talk over such matters as they state No to every issue anyhow < Plaintiff strongly objects to the jurisdiction of the federal court 1st most and then object to the rule 7.1 where by the plaintiff is instructed to inform the lawyers of all acts before filing in some kinda open discussion plaintiff can not afford phone calls, nor wishes to talk to the lawyers who object to all and everything file any way. , Plaintiff fines it is a waste of time and stamps to continue to submit to rules he is not bound to "as member of the bar", plaintiff object to defendants motion to defer response to the court and defendants The plaintiff has a due right in law to present his pleading and filing and to include facts, laws, regs, ect to the court. Plaintiff is not a

lawyer nor a member of the bar and the court must consider this and invoke the standards given as reason to dismissal of plaintiff pleadings in this matter before the court

Jury demand

Plaintiff demands a jury at all times and a correction of the docket to reflect changes in demands for lawful money under constitutional art 1 section 10 back US coin and the amount being 1 million dollars and jurisdiction and cause to be charge to civil rights and wrongful discharge , beach of contract , nature of suit civil rights labor issue and request to remove LMDA form docket

Proof of Service

Steven R Drury, on this day of april 07 , 2004 now certify that I caused a true and correct copies of the forgoing to be sent on the above date here shown to , Holland & Knight , 10 James St., Boston MA 02116 and Krakow and Souris 255 Friend St Boston , MA 02114 and the Federal District Court, Boston MA, by USPS regular mail.

to the lawyers C/o christopher x scarrs and Wm T O'Connell.

by U.S. mail

SR Drury

Steven Roland Drury

04/07/04